

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.urpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,373	04/26/2001	Floribertus C.H. Mokveld	P 280261 9036US/CNT1	6577
909	7590 08/12/2003			
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102			SALVATORE, LYNDA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	19
			DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

.			\bigcirc	A S-
	\bigcirc	Application No.	Applicant(s)	·
Advisory	y Action	09/842,373	MOKVELD ET AL.	
·		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Lynda M Salvatore	1771	
The MAILING DATE	of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 24 July 20 Therefore, further action by the final rejection under 37 CFR 1 condition for allowance; (2) a Examination (RCE) in complia	le applicant is required to 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: timely filed Notice of App	avoid abandonment of thi	s application. A proper re ent which places the appli	ply to a cation in
	PERIOD FOR I	REPLY [check either a) or t	o)]	
	$\frac{2}{2}$ months from the mailing date	•		
event, however, will the stat ONLY CHECK THIS BOX 706.07(f).	utory period for reply expire later WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAs and under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The sof determining the period of extending the expiration date of the shorter ed by the Office later than three	ned statutory period for reply origina	ng date of the final rejection. SOF THE FINAL REJECTION. CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate exult of the fee. The appropriate exally set in the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was	filed on Appella	nt's Brief must be filed with CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid disi	•	
2. The proposed amendm	ent(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issu	ies that would require fur	ther consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue	e of new matter (see Not	e below);		
(c) they are not deeme issues for appeal;		n in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present addit	ional claims without cand	celing a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected clain	ms.
NOTE: See Contin	uation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has ov		· · · ———		
 Newly proposed or ame canceling the non-allow 		uld be allowable if submitte	d in a separate, timely file	d amendment
5. \boxtimes The a) \square affidavit, b) \square application in condition	l exhibit, or c)⊠ request for allowance because:		en considered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit raised by the Examiner		pecause it is not directed S	OLELY to issues which we	ere newly
		ent(s) a) will not be enter would be rejected is provide		and an
The status of the claim	(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:		
Claim(s) allowed:	<u>_</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to: _				
Claim(s) rejected: 11-1	4 and 15-24.			
Claim(s) withdrawn fro	m consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing	correction filed on	is a)□ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Exam	niner.
o. The proposed drawing				
		ment(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	

Continuation She t (PTO-303) 009/842,373





Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Specifically, Applicant's amendment will not be entered because the new solvent range restriction limitations present in claims 11, 12, and 14 raise new issues...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Gentinuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant argues the basis for the final rejection asserting that the claim rejections were not necessitated by amendment since no new limitations were added to claim 11 (depending from originally filed claim 1). This argument is not found persuasive on the grounds that 1) Applicant canceled originally filed claim 1, and 2) preliminarily amended claim 11 only recites, "Shaped article obtained according to a process of claim 1. While the Examiner agrees that no new matter was added to twice amended, now independent claim 11, new limitations, such the chemical and structural features, which were not present in preliminarily amended claim 1, presently exist. As such, the request to withdraw the finality of the rejection is not found persuasive and the final rejection stands as set forth in the last Office Action.

TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700